

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-26 are pending.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the application be forwarded along to issuance

§§ 102(e) and 103(a) Rejections and Common Ownership

Claims 1-12 and 18-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030025728 to Ebbo et al (hereinafter “Ebbo”). Claims 13-17 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebbo in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030046364 to Sisco et al (hereinafter “Sisco”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Office in the 103 rejection of Claims 13-17 and 24-26 asserts “Ebbo does not expressly teach the plurality of user interface templates are created using an Active Sever [sic] Page Language”. *See Office Action, Page 9*. To correct this defect the Office asserts Sisco. **Claim 1** recites in part “a compiled user interface template created using an Active Server Page Language”. **Claim 7** recites in part “identifying a plurality of user interface templates created using an Active Server Page Language”. **Claim 13** recites in part “the plurality of user interface templates are created using an Active Server Page Language”. **Claim 18** recites “a plurality of user interface templates created using an Active Server Page

Language”. **Claim 21** recites in part “means for identifying a plurality of user interface templates created using an Active Server Page Language and associated with a Web-based application”. **Claim 24** recites in part “the plurality of user interface templates are created using an Active Server Page Language”. Thus it is respectfully submitted that as admitted by the Examiner, Ebbo does not teach or suggest these aspects and therefore each of these claims fall under the 103 rejection asserted by the Examiner.

However, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §103(c) and as further detailed at MPEP 706.02(l)(2), the Ebbo reference and the subject Application were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assigned to, the same person, in this case the Microsoft Corporation. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Ebbo is not available as a reference under 103(a) (as 102(e) art) to the subject Application. The Examiner, however, maintains that the Ebbo reference is also available as art under 102(a).

Accordingly, the Applicant is submitting herewith a 131 declaration to remove Ebbo as art under 102(a) and consequently 103(c). As noted in the Declaration, the Invention Disclosure and the Supporting Emails contain support for the claimed subject matter, examples of which may be found at pages 1, 6, 16 and 20. Consequently, the Application respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejections.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: September 4, 2007

By: /William J. Breen, III., #45,313/
William J. Breen III
Reg. No. 45,313
509.755.7253